

## ON FOOT NOTES, GLOSSES, OBITER DICTA AND ASIDES.

All entomologists do it, even as you and I. Not one of us but what, at one time or another, in the course of comment, has inserted an important statement extraneous to the limited subject under discussion. This unfortunate practice leads to many mistakes of fact and interpretation.

Such facts, for example, as the occurrence of Neotropical forms in our Southern border States, are inserted casually in some taxonomic discussion of another group. It might seem that such cases should have a separate and emphasized treatment, otherwise, they are overlooked or lost.

Naturally, the writer's formal acquaintance with these facts refers to hemipterology. But his editorial work has shown him that such things are done in other groups.

Why mention in a commentary on Coleoptera that a given generic name is preoccupied in Hemiptera? What hemipterist is going to critically examine a paper on Coleoptera? Why, in a taxonomic and ecological discussion on a given group, state that a particular food plant harbors a diversity of other forms? Who would think of looking for food-plants of Chrysomelidae in an article on Hemiptera? Such things should be given a separate emphasized mention or they are lost.

Why extensively discuss teratology in a taxonomic article on a certain genus, because a synonym was erected on an imperfect specimen? Who would think of looking for such a distinct matter therein?

Why insert a question as to specific validities in an otherwise bare faunal list? Such an item demands separate and more or less formal and documented individual treatment.

Why put in as a footnote a remark or statement which is integral to the matter discussed and to its proper understanding?—  
J. R. T.-B.

---

**Second Notice to Authors.**—The numerous long papers on hand will delay the publication of the latest received. We cannot guarantee prompt publication of papers over 6 typewritten pages, double spaced.—Editor.